HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIII, No. 3 Saturday, January 21, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Budget: The President's budget, offered to Congress, is regarded all over the Capital as simply a "spend-and-spend-and-elect-and-elect" device, in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins. Conservative Democrats like Byrd of Virginia sound a note of deep pessimism about the chances of fiscal soundness — Byrd pointing out how the President has brought up proposals amounting to $8 billion in "new spending." Strategists in the White House gleefully point out that the President's budget leaves the New Deal Democrats with no issue. Republican conservatives privately deplore the whole business.

Some of the latter claim that Ike held out for financial stability for three years, but — since his illness — the "liberals" in the Palace Guard have now taken over the helm and the budget is an outstanding example of "liberal" machiavellianism. This conclusion fortifies developing conservative opinion that Ike should not run again, since he will not be able to check the "liberalism" of his advisers in the White House — in view of the impaired condition of his health which he described in his press conference of January 19. This opinion further strengthens the desire that the President should definitely announce his plans soon, so as not to embarrass other potential Republican candidates.

Ridgway Row: The articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* by former Army Chief of Staff General Matthew Ridgway have stirred up a tempest in Washington and provided the Democrats with a strong campaign argument against the Eisenhower Administration — "playing politics and economy with National Defense." The truth is that the Administration is in no good position to counterattack. One line of retort to Ridgway could be that he is a narrow zealot for ground forces and resents the preference in appropriations given to the Air Force and guided missiles. Another retort could be that the "liberal" columnists (now busily and happily boosting Ridgway's stand) are for bigger spending for all services — Air Force, Navy, guided missiles and Army — in short, simply for spending, period.

But, unfortunately, the GOP Administration has never fully embraced the "air strategy" of defense and has followed a policy — a dangerous one according to some observers — of skimping on appropriations for our strategic bombing command while still devoting no little money to obsolescent ground force material.

Indeed, under the new budget, the procurement of Air Force combat planes will actually be reduced about 20% during the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1957.

Consequently, the Democratic opposition has plenty of ammunition and the Republicans are vulnerable. Worse still, Eisenhower is vulnerable — because much of the acclaim given him was clearly based on his reputation as a general who could be counted upon to provide the country with the best defense possible.

That Dulles Article: Premier Sir Anthony Eden arrives here soon after suffering an unprecedented convulsion within his own Administration party. No one here can recall any similar revolt in peacetime against the leader of the "old school tie" party in England within recent decades. Eden, therefore, will presumably seek to regain his popularity by winning some extraordinary concessions from Uncle Sam. The word goes around that he wants to persuade the Eisenhower regime to appease Red China — long a principal objective of London's policy. Indeed, the way low-level British diplomats have been conversing with low-level U.S. emissaries indicates that such an approach is under way.

This background of Eden's planned visit and the reaction to it of Secretary of State Dulles is — according to Constantine Brown, diplomatic cor-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

respondent of the Washington *Star* — the real story behind the Dulles remarks in the controversial *Life* magazine article. Brown reports that the publication of an account of how he had foiled the Reds at the risk of war "was a shrewd move intended to warn the British government on the eve of Prime Minister Eden's visit that we are not prepared to yield to its expected insistence on placating the Peiping regime. The State Department knew about Sir Anthony's projected visit long before it was officially announced. There has been sufficient time for magazine diplomacy."

Specifically, what the British want us to do is to schedule a meeting between Chou En-lai, Red China's Foreign Minister, and Secretary Dulles. The latter reportedly wants nothing of the sort. He believes this would be interpreted throughout the Far East as another American capitulation.

Lausche: By the grapevine, HUMAN EVENTS learns that Governor Frank Lausche has received an offer of backing from two very important Democrats in the state of Indiana — Mayor Philip Bayt of Indianapolis and his campaign manager, Charles Boswell. Bayt won his recent election as a result of a switch by a large number of Republicans, discontented with the Craig-Eisenhower regimes.

Observers in Washington consider this news as favorable to the progress of Lausche's candidature. It is pointed out that the labor bosses have very little influence on the Indiana State Democratic Party, except in the northern section of the state. The rank and file of Indiana Democrats, therefore, it is argued, might well vote to send a delegation (primary election in May) pledged to the Ohioan to the Democratic Convention next summer.

Political experts in the Hoosier state, however, believe that — before such a primary — Lausche would have to visit the state and make himself better known among the politicos and voters, if he is to succeed. So far Lausche has shown himself disinclined to go outside his own state. It is believed, however, that this intention is not firm and that the Ohio Governor may try his luck in the neighboring state of Indiana. What is needed — say veterans of many primary campaigns — to get the Lausche drive rolling is for Democrats of one Northern state (other than Ohio) to jump on the Lausche bandwagon.

Heir of McCarran: The political dynasty of the powerful anti-Communist and pro-American Senator from Nevada, who died over a year ago, is expected to carry on effectively in the coming elections — despite contrary predictions by his enemies among the "liberals." After Pat's death, his friends put in as his successor in the Senate an excellent Nevada Democrat, Alan Bible, who has made a good record in the upper house in the past year. However, for personal reasons, Bible has withdrawn from the race for re-election (his term ends next year).

Accordingly, the McCarran following in Nevada is grooming as Pat's successor in the Democratic race for Senatorial nomination his long-time staff member, "brain-truster" and right-hand man in his famous investigations of subversives — Jay Sourwine, at present chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Sourwine made a big name for himself originally as an able cross-examiner for the same Committee during the investigations and hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations. In his native Nevada, he is considered to be ideally fitted to carry out the philosophy, ideas and policies of the late Senator Pat McCarran.

Republican Action: National Republican Chairman Leonard Hall has been notified by the New Jersey Committee for a Stronger Republican Party that it "would be unalterably opposed to any ticket which included, as candidate for President or Vice President, the name of Clifford P. Case, regardless of who his running mate might be." The release referred to "persistent reports, in the press and elsewhere, that there is a move underway in certain quarters to place the name of Senator Case before the people as the party's nominee for President or Vice President." The New Jersey group attacked Case's record in the Senate on a number of points in which — it charged — his policy conformed to that of the A.D.A. or left-wing Democrats. The Committee, whose headquarters are at Morristown, N. J., is a conservative group which opposes all forms of "New Dealism" and leftward tendencies in the Republican Party.

Dewey: In the present confused atmosphere in Washington, it is impossible to compute how many times the name of former Governor Thomas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

E. Dewey comes up in connection with talk about Ike's successor or, if Ike runs, his vice-presidential running mate. Newsies will tell you that it is often, but as the talk appears to be mainly talk, they rarely make a story out of it. Visitors to the Capital, particularly Republicans who see other Republicans, report a great deal of this sub-rosa, word-of-mouth advertisement for the former New York leader. This neo-Dewey phenomenon became so marked in the past week, that one journalist queried the New York ex-Governor about the substance of rumors and received a denial from Dewey of any ambition for national office.

Those whose job it is to watch and assay national politics in the Capital find the chatter about Dewey, either for first or second place on a ticket, somewhat incredible. Has the old split in the GOP healed to that extent? It is known that Ike himself has won over some former Taft followers — but it has never been remarked that the friends of the defeated Ohio Senator have ever forgotten or forgiven the events at the GOP convention in 1952. A number of members of the press, who attended that convention, possess in their files a document which bears testimony to the heat generated among the conservatives when Dewey cracked the whip against the Taftites.

The document mentioned is a blast against the New York Governor with the headline "Sink Dewey" and the sub-title, "End Dewey's Control of our Party — Eight Years of Deweyism and Defeat." It was issued under the signature of Taft's nomination campaign chairman, David S. Ingalls (Taft's cousin). The text is frankly abusive of Dewey and is expressed in strong, melodramatic phraseology, of which its finale is characteristic: "Until and unless Dewey and Deweyism are crushed, our party can never win and America can never be made safe from the insidious efforts of the New Dealers, whatever the party label, to take us down the road to socialism and dictatorship."

On the (Red) Party Line: Will history repeat? The Communist *Daily Worker*, frequently the bellwether of liberal-lefty concerted campaigns, is on a new tangent: give the McCarthy treatment to Mississippi's courageous Democratic Senator James O. Eastland. He's anathema to the Commies on two counts: one, he is a leader of the southern anti-integrationists; and two, as Chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, he lets the chips fall where they may, even when it's on the sacrosanct-to-some *New York Times*.

Almost every issue of the *Daily Worker* carries at least one top anti-Eastland story. The unachievable basic pitch of its campaign is to oust him from the Senate. But they'd be happy to settle for some wrist-slapping reprimand *a la* McCarthy. Sample headlines of the past week: "400 UAW Delegates to Demand Eastland Removal;" "Neuberger Hits Attack by Eastland on Press Freedom;" "Illinois CIO Urges Senate Take Action on Eastland;" "Offers Albany Bill Urging Congress Expel Senator Eastland."

The *Daily Worker* was the early front runner in the long fight to "get" Senator Joe McCarthy, eventually drummed up support among such so-called "liberal" outfits, which carried the ball, as the National Committee for an Effective Congress, Americans for Democratic Action, *et al.* Will the same thing happen now? Notably, the *Daily Worker* of recent weeks has been devoting kind words to both organizations; top page 3 story in Tuesday's issue, for example, was "Telford Taylor Files Petition in High Court for Junius Scales," Taylor being a high mogul of NCEC and Scales a North Carolina Red convicted under the Smith Act.

It could be the handwriting.

Letter from GEORGE A. RENTSCHLER, Chairman, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp.: "I have read HUMAN EVENTS from the time it first came out. Its frankness and honest thought is refreshing in this day of propaganda. If only one paper were available to me, it would be difficult to give up HUMAN EVENTS."

Mystery of Pearl Harbor: Senator McCarthy, according to reports on Capitol Hill, is readying an important contribution to the growing literature of revisionism — the "revising" of the official propaganda history of the late war and how we got into it. A number of historians — Beard, Tansill, Morgenstern, Flynn, etc., — have pushed far this work of debunking the official version produced by the paid apologists of the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations. The Wisconsin Senator

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now, it is said, has unearthed some new, hitherto obscured documentary evidence linking (1) those Anglophiles and internationalists who were seeking to bring us into World War II by involving us in war with Japan and (2) the Communist network which (after Hitler's June, 1941 attack on Soviet Russia) was intriguing and utilizing the subversive apparatus within the U.S. Government to the same end.

The *piece de resistance* of McCarthy's research reportedly is a memorandum — the significance of which many experts had hitherto overlooked — written by Harry Dexter White, long an assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and identified by Whittaker Chambers as a Soviet agent. White drew up, late in November, 1941, a memorandum for the State Department which recommended that the latter present demands on Japan to make a series of drastic concessions — which obviously Japan would not make unless its proud militarist leaders were prepared to abdicate its position in Asia. Thus White, the friend of Soviet Russia, contributed his weight — who knows, it may have been decisive — to that already in the works, exerted by the Anglophiles and internationalists in the State Department to bring the U.S. into the war via the Pacific theater.

The White document corresponds closely with the famous State Department "ultimatum" of November 20 which in effect triggered the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As Secretary of War Stimson said, it solved the problem of how to maneuver Japan into the position of "firing the first shot." Eminent historians have examined the White document, which McCarthy has studied, and pronounced it authentic and have praised McCarthy's contribution to the unravelling of what has too long been called "the mystery of Pearl Harbor." It is believed that McCarthy's study will soon be released to the public.

Truman's Accolade: Henry Regnery, Chicago book publisher, sent a copy of Chesly Manly's *The UN Record* to former President Truman, soliciting his opinion on the volume. Regnery now allows that he struck pay dirt. For, Mr. Truman replies: "I have been reading *The UN Record* by Chesly Manly. It is a most interesting book for the simple reason that there is hardly a paragraph without an untrue statement in it. I am sorry that this is the case, but of course a man who has been associated all his life with the *Chicago Tribune* would be expected to do just what Mr. Manly has done — tell the truth about nothing."

It may be that Manly's treatment of Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur touched off this characteristic Trumanism. In Chesly Manly's opinion, the real tragedy of this whole historic affair was not the actual removal of MacArthur by Truman, but the failure of Congress to remove Truman. "If an army commander, of his own initiative, should willfully submit to rules of combat giving the enemy an extraordinary advantage and multiplying the slaughter of his own troops, he would be shot. Clearly, then, a commander-in-chief who does this should be impeached and removed from office, in the manner prescribed in the Constitution for high crimes and misdemeanors."

Lausche or Knowland on "Meet the Press": The complete transcripts of two important "Meet the Press" broadcasts may be obtained from HUMAN EVENTS.

Governor Lausche was grilled on January 8; Senator Knowland on January 15.

The price schedule for EITHER transcript is as follows: single copies 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots, $22 per thousand. Specify WHICH transcript you want — Lausche's or Knowland's.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1955.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 3 HUMAN EVENTS January 21, 1956

Article Section

VIRGINIA SHOWS A WAY

By FRANK CHODOROV

PARLIAMENT, said a British wag, has been known to do the right thing, but never for the right reasons. That is another way of saying that a political body, following the line of expediency, may accidentally hit upon a course rooted in right principle. The result is none the less desirable because it is arrived at by chance. Many a patient has been cured that way.

The Virginia General Assembly last December authorized a referendum on whether to call a convention for the purpose of considering a change in the State Constitution. On January 9 the referendum was held, and the people approved by a 2 to 1 vote the calling of the convention. The ultimate effect of this vote is to clear the way for the use of public funds for the support of private, non-sectarian schools. This purpose is the central theme of the report of the Gray Commission, which was appointed by Governor Stanley in August, 1954, after the United States Supreme Court outlawed race segregation in public schools.

Briefly, the report proposes that local communities be allowed to discontinue public schools at their discretion. Whether or not such schools are maintained, a student who prefers an accredited private school will be allowed a tuition grant equal to the present per-pupil school cost of public schooling. There are other recommendations, but they all rest on this one.

The effect of this proposal — and that is the implied intent — will be that white parents will have the choice of sending their children to schools which do or do not enroll Negroes, and Negro parents will have the choice of public schools, integrated, or schools for Negroes only. That is where a point of principle comes into play: should parents have the right of deciding on the companionship of their children? (Involved is the larger question of whether the selection of associates is a prerogative of the individual or is a matter of public policy.)

From the point of view of egalitarians, collectivists and all advocates of majority infallibility — sometimes called "democrats" — the choosing of their children's companions is not a right inherent in parenthood. The exercise of such choice, they hold, is a social evil. To Virginians, and other southern citizens, the choice of associates is not only a private matter, but the parent who does not concern himself with it is neglectful of his obligation to his children. Even in the North, where there is no "Negro question," it is common practice for white parents to seek out schools which have no Negro pupils and to locate themselves in such districts; this too is segregation, by choice, not by law.

One side or the other in this matter of race discrimination, or maybe both, must be in error. But, since when is it sinful to be wrong?

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each of us is in error from somebody's point of view; to the Hindu the Christian is in dire need of understanding, to the socialist the individualist is benighted, and Republicans look upon Democrats as fools of the first water. Taking us as a whole, therefore, we are all wrong. But, since each of us values his opinion highly and wishes to hold on to it, it behooves each of us to concede to the other the right to hold on to his; social life would be impossible without that concession. To deny to any of us the right of opinion is to curtail freedom, besides stultifying thought. If there is any absolute wrong, any positive error, it is the use of force in an attempt to achieve conformity — which is exactly what is wrong with the decision of the Supreme Court on segregation.

Thus, whatever the motivation behind the action of the Virginia legislature and the electorate, in the referendum, the accidental consequence is to point up a basic principle of freedom — the right to be wrong. For that the country should be thankful.

If the Gray Commission's report is put into law, we may expect other accidental consequences that should go a long way toward solving some of the current, vexing problems of our educational system. Nearly everybody, teachers as well as parents, is convinced that the system needs some overhauling, although there is violent disagreement on what should be done. The Virginia experiment may very well settle the argument.

The effect of tuition grants — which is really the remission of taxes — will be to create an effective demand for private schooling. In economic parlance, an effective demand is a desire backed up with the wherewithal to satisfy it. In this case the parent will have the capital to invest in a school of his own choosing; a market for private schools will arise.

At first, of course, the difference between private and public schools will be along segregation lines. Once this matter is taken care of, other points of differentiation will show up, either in curricula or methods of teaching. There will be some prescribed requirements imposed on the private schools, but these will be necessarily general in scope; many details will come within the discretion of the school management, as well as of the local communities, which have the authority to abolish public schools altogether.

For instance, some private schools, at the insistence of their customers, will go in for teaching along traditional lines, with emphasis on subject matter rather than methodology, leaving what is called "progressive" education to others. We can be sure of that because "progressivism" has come in for a great deal of criticism throughout the country. Under the Virginia plan, this controversy will be settled by the inexorable law of competition. Perhaps "progressivism," with its insistence on educating the group rather than the individual, will in time prove itself to the satisfaction of its clientele; perhaps the trade will actually prefer that conglomerate course known as "social science" to the old fashioned disciplines of history, geography and civics. The market will decide.

The big change will be in the high schools. Some parents still hold that education is a process of disciplining the mind, not the learning of a trade, and are of the opinion that a knowledge of mathematics, rhetoric, literature and even Latin will prosper their offspring more than knowing how to behave on a "date" or how to drive a car. For their children, if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they can make the grade, there will be a classical high school; the public high school, with its emphasis on functional courses, will be available to those children whose talents lie in that direction. Parents, with money in pocket, will shop around for the kind of education they deem best or for which their children show an aptitude.

All sorts of schools, within the limits set up by the authorities, will cater to the trade. Educators, like merchants and manufacturers, will set up in business, either to supply a known demand or to offer something "new" or "different." Teachers will heed the call of the market place, not the dicta of a bureaucracy. Proficiency will be rewarded; the better schools and the better teachers will become known by their product and will reap the deserved harvest; the others will fall by the wayside, according to the law of competition. Yes, parents will buy education even as they buy medical or legal services or even groceries, and will of necessity become as keenly interested in the mental progress of their children as they are in their health.

Incidentally, there may be schools in which the tenets of collectivism, even Marxism, are taught and preached. There can be no objection to that, if the parents use the tuition grants, which was their own money in the first place, to support such schools. Much of the criticism now levelled at the public school is that such subjects have seeped into the curriculum and that children, having no avenue of escape under the law, must submit to the indoctrination. In point of fact, it is compulsory support of, and compulsory attendance at schools, in which collectivism is furthered, that is irritating; no one would bother if the compulsion were removed. Perhaps, in spite of the noise they generate, the collectivists will prove themselves to be a minority too small to support schools of their own. The market will tell.

Perhaps the tuition grants under the Virginia plan will not be sufficient to meet all the costs of private school operation, and parents will have to dig down for the difference. Those who have the means will not object to that; even after paying public school taxes many now send their children to private schools, sometimes at considerable sacrifice, and enrollment at these schools is on the increase. But, the need of supplementing the tuition grants will diminish as competition and increased demand force costs down, even as has happened with automobiles and television sets; the free market has a way of adjusting price to effective demand. In the meantime, or until the market place gets up a full head of steam, some parents may find the private school, even with the tuition grants, beyond their means. Americans being what they are, there will be plenty of scholarships for children who show an aptitude for learning; the Virginia plan will thus arouse the virtue of charity, which tends to go to sleep when government takes over its offices.

THERE IS NO social ill, real or imaginary, that competition cannot cure. Right now there is a great clamor from professional educators for Federal aid to education. It is asserted that there is a great and increasing shortage of classroom space, and that states and local communities are in no position to make up the deficiency. The money for construction must come from the Federal government, they insist, ignoring the fact that the Federal government has no other source of income than the taxes it levies on citizens of those states and communities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If there is a shortage of classroom space, the Virginia plan will, in time, overcome it. For, it will put into the educational business the same profit motive that finds space in any other line. Undoubtedly, as the opponents of the Virginia plan insist, the private school will find classroom space hard to come by, especially as, according to some lawyers, the state and the communities are forbidden by law to lease or sell their equipment. But, admission that there will be a shortage of space is admission that there will be demand for space; that is, that the private school will not want for customers.

Until capital is enlisted in the private school business and construction can meet the demand, makeshift devices such as private homes, vacancies in commercial buildings and churches that are empty the greater part of the week can be resorted to; in pioneer times, the church often doubled as a schoolroom. Good teaching is not a matter of physical equipment, it is a matter of skill and dedication. However, an effective demand always creates a corresponding supply, and in due time there will be school space enough, and without resort to higher taxes, bonds or Federal aid.

As private enterprise will solve the space problem, so it will solve the teacher problem. Some educators complain that there is a shortage of teachers and that this is due to the prevailing low scale of wages. Perhaps this is so. The private school that renders the best service, in the opinion of the buying public, will attract the most students, and its increased income will enable it to pay accordingly; it will have to in order to attract teachers who attract more students. The rising pay scale will thus induce more young men and women to enter the profession.

To be sure, this will go hard on the public school. To stay in business, it will have to meet the standards set by the private school. If it does not, it will quietly pass out of existence. It may sound like sacrilege to suggest the end of the public school. But if it passes out because the children are getting their education elsewhere, will it be missed? If it disappears because it cannot throw its inadequacies into the lap of the public, if it cannot ask for more taxes to get itself out of its own dilemmas, its passing will be a blessing.

THUS, the Virginia plan, put forth for the single purpose of satisfying the Supreme Court decision without offending local sensibilities, has within it the potential of liquidating the acrimonious cross-country debates over public school taxes and bonds, over curricula and operational methods. The professional educationists, and their collectivistic friends, will at first make the going hard, even to the extent of appealing to the Supreme Court for help in blocking the plan. Private capitalists and enterprising teachers will be hesitant about entering the field until the smoke dies down, but ultimately the private school will come into its own in Virginia, and its progress will be watched by every state in the Union. For, putting the matter of segregation aside, the public school question is hot all over the country. Virginia could well be rendering a national service by its experiment.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED